



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,937	07/03/2003	Takashi Hashimoto	2003_0881A	3943
513	7590	11/02/2007	EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.			MEONSKE, TONIA L	
2033 K STREET N. W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 800			2181	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/02/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/611,937	HASHIMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tonia L. Meonske	2181

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2007.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 16-20 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 16-20 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 16-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al., U.S. Patent 6,347,344, herein referred to as Baker, in view of Takashima, US Patent 4,614,342, herein referred to as Takashima.

3. As per **claim 16**, Baker discloses a data processing system, comprising:

a. a first data processing unit operable to perform data processing according to a program control (See figure 1A: There is CPU C0 and C1 are the first data processing units.);

b. second data processing units, each of said second data processing units being operable to perform data processing under wired logic control, and each of said plurality of second data processing units comprising (See figure 20 and column 43, lines 55-59: The fixed function unit has multiple units associated with it for performing a certain operation.);

c. a calculating unit (See figure 20: 3D unit 64 performs the operations.); and

- d. a selector unit (See figure 20 and column 22, lines 41-51: The transfer engine (with its round-robin priority scheduler) is used to select appropriate areas to transfer data.);
- e. a storage unit operable to store data (See figure 20: D Cache 616 and DRAM 128);
- f. a first data transfer unit operable to connect said first data processing unit with each of said plurality of second data processing units, via said storage unit (See figure 1A and 20 and column 31, lines 27-30: Data transfer switch 112 is operable to connect various functional units.); and
- g. a second data transfer unit operable to connect each of said plurality of second data processing units with each other (See figure 20: The DTS I/F 614 unit attaches the various processing units of the fixed function unit.), wherein
- h. said second data transfer unit is operable to connect at least one of said plurality of second data processing units in series to another second data processing unit (See figure 20: The DTS I/F 614 unit attaches the various processing units of the fixed function unit.), and
- i. said selector unit is operable to determine a destination of a data transfer from among each of said plurality of second data processing units according to a link map table (See figure 13, column 23, lines 7-12, and column 30, lines 40-60: Destination descriptors are available to be used.).

4. Baker has not taught a plurality of at least two second data processing units. However, as an initial matter, duplicating parts for multiple effect has not been held to

be a patentable distinct (*In re Harza*, 274 F.3d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA))

Additionally, Takashima has taught a plurality of at least two second data processing units (abstract) for the desirable purpose of implementing an electronic gaming machine. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the data processing system of Baker include a plurality of at least two second data processing units, as taught by Takashima, for the desirable purpose of implementing an electronic gaming machine.

5. As per **claim 17**, Baker discloses the data processing system according to Claim 16, wherein said first data processing unit is operable to control the data transfer via said second data transfer unit (See figure 20: The DTS I/F 614 is attached to the data transfer switch 112, which is controlled by the memory controller directly. This means that the transfer switch 112 does control the DTS 614 unit.).

6. As per **claim 18**, Baker discloses the data processing system according to claim 16, further comprising a first data transfer control unit operable to control the data transfer via said second data transfer unit (See figure 1A and 20: The data transfer switch is controlled by a memory control 124.).

7. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker, in view of Takashima, US Patent 4,614,342, herein referred to as Takashima, and in view of Lee, US Patent 6,005,937, herein referred to as Lee.

8. As per **claim 19**, Baker teaches the data processing system according to Claim 16.
9. Baker does not teach the data processing system with its fixed function unit is capable of encoding.
10. Lee does teach, wherein said second data processing unit is operable to perform an encoding process (See abstract).
11. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Baker such that the data processing system with its fixed function unit is capable of encoding. Both Baker and Lee teach a fixed function unit within a multimedia system (like that of the invention) and whereas Baker had identified 3D graphics as the type of operation to be optimized, Lee chose encoding/decoding. Both are meant to improve a multimedia system and thus if one having ordinary skill in the art desired the data sharing/transferring capabilities of Baker but wanted encoding/decoding to be optimized, one could have combined such an invention with that of Lee. It is noted that the 3D operations have no bearing on the data transfer scheme of Baker.
12. As per **claim 20**, Baker teaches the data processing system according to Claim 16.
13. Baker does not teach the data processing system with its fixed function unit is capable of decoding.

14. Lee does teach, wherein said second data processing unit is operable to perform a decoding process (See abstract).
15. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Baker such that the data processing system with its fixed function unit is capable of decoding. Both Baker and Lee teach a fixed function unit within a multimedia system (like that of the invention) and whereas Baker had identified 3D graphics as the type of operation to be optimized, Lee chose encoding/decoding. Both are meant to improve a multimedia system and thus if one having ordinary skill in the art desired the data sharing/transferring capabilities of Baker but wanted encoding/decoding to be optimized, one could have combined such an invention with that of Lee. It is noted that the 3D operations have no bearing on the data transfer scheme of Baker.

***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

18. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tonia L. Meonske whose telephone number is (571) 272-4170. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday with first Friday's off.

20. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alford Kindred can be reached on (571) 272-4037. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

21. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TLM

*Tonia L. Meonske*

/Tonia L. Meonske/

Tonia L. Meonske

October 24, 2007